

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

Michael Ledante Morrow,

Plaintiff,

v.

Mark C. Fleegle, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-cv-5193

Judge Michael H. Watson

Magistrate Judge Vascura

ORDER

Upon initial screen pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and § 1915A, Magistrate Judge Vascura issued a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) recommending the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. R&R, ECF No. 3.

Plaintiff filed a document titled “Fed. Crim. Complaint,” which the Clerk’s Office docketed as “Objection to Order and Report and Recommendation.” Obj., ECF No. 6.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(2), a party may serve and file “specific written objections” to the R&R. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3), the Undersigned “must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to.”


Despite its docket title, Plaintiff’s “Objection” is not a proper objection under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Rather, it is a three-page document that merely restates Plaintiff’s version of the events underlying his Complaint.

Obj., ECF No. 6. Plaintiff does not even mention Magistrate Judge Vascura's R&R, let alone argue which specific portions of the R&R he objects to and why.

The R&R warned Plaintiff that the failure to object would result in the waiver of the right to have the Undersigned perform a de novo review as well as a waiver of the right to appeal the Undersigned's adoption of the R&R. R&R 7, ECF No. 3.

Because Plaintiff did not offer any actual objections to the R&R, the Undersigned **ADOPTS** the same without conducting a de novo review. Further, the Court certifies under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(3)(A) and 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith given Plaintiff's waiver.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



MICHAEL H. WATSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT